

waste, fraud and abuse within the Job Corp program. Furthermore, why is the Senate being asked to make a program change to a 40-year-old program within an Emergency Supplemental bill? Why hasn't the Department of Labor been consulted in making this unprecedented move away from accountability? Why hasn't the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions held a single hearing about this radical change to the Job Corps program?

Due to time constraints and my desire to move Senate business forward, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

AMENDMENT NO. 3777, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 3777, as modified.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent to add Senator BROWNBACK as a cosponsor to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I know of no Senators seeking recognition for discussing the amendment any further. The amendment has been described by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. The Senate is well aware of its intent. These are funds that are being directed to the situation in Darfur in the Sudan. There is a U.N. mission there with responsibilities for helping to deal with the misery and challenges to life that exist there.

I ask the author of the amendment if that is the purpose of the amendment? It is money that would go for the purpose of supporting the work of the U.N. mission in Darfur?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished chairman for his inquiry. The answer is yes, our effort is to ensure the ability of the U.N. work to continue and to ultimately have the

wherewithal when a peacekeeping force is called for to be able to have that move forward so we can hopefully end the genocide in Darfur.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the distinguished Senator for his explanation and his description of the language.

I know of no requests for yeas and nays on the amendment. I suggest we proceed to a voice vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on April 6, I spoke on the floor about the humanitarian catastrophe in Darfur where more than 200,000 people have perished from genocidal violence, hunger and disease. Today I rise to strongly support the amendment offered by Senator MENENDEZ to help meet the emergency need for additional funding for peacekeeping in Darfur.

President Bush, this Congress, and the international community have recognized the need for double the number of peacekeeping troops in Darfur to stabilize the crisis and begin to lay the groundwork for a resolution to this conflict. But the President has not requested the funds to support additional troops. Rhetoric is cheap, but when the issue is the survival of thousands of vulnerable people, words do not suffice. The \$60 million proposed by the Senator from New Jersey is the minimum needed.

In addition to Sudan, there are 12 other U.N. peacekeeping missions that face severe funding shortages in fiscal year 2006. The State Department will be \$383 million short in the next few months and will have no alternative but to defer those bills into next year, which creates a problem for our fiscal year 2007 appropriations process. The President's inadequate budget request, which is supported by the majority in Congress, ensures that we are perpetually behind in our U.N. peacekeeping payments.

This supplemental does not fund a U.N. mission to Darfur, which is what we all recognize is needed. Senator MENENDEZ's amendment would at least provide initial funding for such a mission. Nor does this bill fund other U.N. peacekeeping missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, and Haiti.

The U.S. does not contribute troops to any of these missions. But by not paying our share of peacekeeping dues on time the countries that contribute the troops are less willing to do so.

The amount we pay is a tiny fraction of what we would have to spend to deploy our own troops. The GAO recently found that it would "cost the U.S. about twice as much as the U.N. to conduct peacekeeping", and the U.S. only contributes 25 percent of the cost. That makes the savings 8 times less—the U.N. is half as expensive and we only pay a quarter of the costs. We are not prepared to put our troops into these countries and the costs would be far higher to the U.S. if we did.

The fiscal year 2006 budget we passed last year under-funded the U.S. dues for peacekeeping by \$383 million. The

U.S. has voted to expand the troop level in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, yet our share is underfunded by approximately \$80 million in fiscal year 2006. Ensuring a smooth transition after the recent presidential election in Haiti is a stated priority of the administration, yet the peacekeeping mission to Haiti is underfunded by at least \$40 million. Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Kosovo are all underfunded in the next year by about \$383 million.

So what happens when the U.S. or other donors do not pay or defer their peacekeeping bills? The U.N. adjusts its bill paying to keep its core missions running. And like anyone who hasn't been paid on time, the U.N. pays those accounts which have immediate needs and defers paying bills where creditors will grant it leeway. In the first half of the year, the U.N. system is relatively flush with cash from other countries' dues payments. It can and does shift from general accounts into those with funding shortfalls. But by mid-year, if major contributors are behind on their bill payments, the U.N. will resort to other tactics like paying for equipment, travel, and short-term logistical expenses while deferring payments to troop contributing nations that tend to be more forgiving of late U.N. payments.

Nations that contribute troops to U.N. peacekeeping bear the primary burden of covering for U.S. shortfalls to the U.N. peacekeeping account. When the U.S. repaid its arrears to the U.N. under the Helms-Biden deal, for example, the U.N. repaid fourteen to fifteen countries for up to 3 years' worth of deferred troop contributing costs.

Additionally, the United States' lack of payment for peacekeeping in the past has created significant resistance to U.S. efforts to change assessment rates and enact reform at the U.N. During the Helms-Biden era and before the U.S. committed to repaying its dues, the U.S. lost seats on key U.N. governing bodies because of its arrearages.

Over the course of the last several years, the United States has increasingly seen the need for U.N. peacekeeping. This has led to an unprecedented demand for peacekeeping troops. If we want to continue to increase this burden sharing arrangement, we need to pay troop contributing nations—like Pakistan, India, and South Africa—for services rendered. After all, they are putting their troops into harm's way so United States troops don't have to.

We face a situation where commitments were made, funds are needed, these countries are very unstable, and the commitment of U.S. troops is not an option. We must pay our share so the U.N. can send peacekeepers to Sudan, but also to support U.N. missions in other critical areas in the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment 3777, as modified.